

On meson dominance in the ‘second class’ $\tau \rightarrow \eta\pi\nu_\tau$ decay

N. Paver*

*Department of Physics,
University of Trieste,
34100 Trieste, Italy*

$\mathcal{E}$

*INFN-Sezione di Trieste,
34100 Trieste, Italy*

Riazuddin†

*Centre for Advanced Mathematics and Physics,
National University of Sciences and Technology,
Rawalpindi, Pakistan*

$\mathcal{E}$

*National Centre for Physics,
Quaid-i-Azam University,
Islamabad, Pakistan*

(Dated: May 24, 2010)

Abstract

Motivated by recent estimates of the isospin-violating process $\tau \rightarrow \eta\pi\nu_\tau$ in QCD, mostly relying on the ρ and a_0 dominance of the relevant form factors near threshold, we present an assessment for the branching ratio that accounts for additional, potential, effects from the lowest radial excitations $\rho' \equiv \rho(1450)$ and $a'_0 \equiv a_0(1450)$, respectively, also lying in the decay phase space.

PACS numbers: 13.35Dx, 12.60Cn

*nello.paver@ts.infn.it

†riazuddin@ncp.edu.pk

Renewed interest has recently been devoted to the semileptonic decay $\tau \rightarrow \eta\pi\nu_\tau$. This process belongs to the historical category of “second class current” decays [1], and is only viable in the Standard Model V-A semileptonic weak interactions through isotopic spin and G-parity violation, with a probability strongly suppressed by the smallness of the $u - d$ current quark mass difference. Therefore, if measured with a significant branching ratio, this decay could signal some “new physics”. Current theoretical estimates indicate for this transition a Standard Model branching ratio of the order of a unit times 10^{-5} [2–5], to be compared with the experimental upper limit 1.4×10^{-4} [6]. This should leave some room for revealing “non-standard physics” in high statistics studies of this decay, as recently discussed in Ref. [2] and, also, earlier in Ref. [7].

The theoretical estimates of the $\tau \rightarrow \eta\pi\nu_\tau$ form factors in the timelike region are based either directly on *ad hoc* $\rho(770)$ and $a_0(980)$ polar forms or, like in Refs. [3, 5], on chiral perturbation theory [8] supplemented, above the $\eta\pi$ threshold, by ρ and a_0 poles. In this note, we present an attempt to phenomenologically parameterize the form factors in terms of both the chiral $SU(3) \times SU(3)$ symmetry breaking expansion and the ρ, a_0 resonance poles with, in addition, account of the lowest ρ, a_0 radial excitations $\rho(1450)$ and $a_0(1450)$. These resonances are observed experimentally with masses well-within the $\eta\pi$ invariant mass range allowed to the decay and, therefore, it should be interesting to assess the size of their effects relative to the ground state meson exchanges. Among other things, this would allow to make tests of the earlier theoretical predictions.

With $V_\mu = \bar{u}\gamma_\mu d$ the weak vector current, the hadronic matrix element for $\tau \rightarrow \eta\pi\nu_\tau$ can be decomposed into spin-1 and spin-0 exchange form factors, respectively, as

$$\langle \pi^+(k)\eta(p)|V_\mu|0\rangle = -\sqrt{2}\left[f_1(t)\left((p-k)_\mu - \frac{M_\eta^2 - M_\pi^2}{t}q_\mu\right) + f_0(t)\frac{M_\eta^2 - M_\pi^2}{t}q_\mu\right]. \quad (1)$$

Here, $q = p + k$ and $t = q^2$ is the invariant mass squared of the emitted $\eta\pi$ pair. Finiteness of the matrix element at $t = 0$ implies the condition $f_1(0) = f_0(0)$.

With $t_0 = (M_\eta + M_\pi)^2$ and $\lambda(x, y, z) = x^2 + y^2 + z^2 - 2(xy + yz + zx)$, the partial width is:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(\tau^+ \rightarrow \eta\pi^+\nu_\tau) &= \frac{G_F^2|V_{ud}|^2}{384\pi^3 M_\tau^3} \int_{t_0}^{M_\tau^2} \frac{dt}{t^3} \lambda^{1/2}(t, M_\eta^2, M_\pi^2)(M_\tau^2 - t)^2 \\ &\times \left[|f_1(t)|^2 \left((2t + M_\tau^2)\lambda(t, M_\eta^2, M_\pi^2)\right) + |f_0(t)|^2 3M_\tau^2(M_\eta^2 - M_\pi^2)^2\right] \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

For the value of form factors at $t = 0$, the prediction from leading and next-to-leading

order in chiral symmetry breaking, explicitly displaying the isospin breaking character of the process at the current quark level, is [3, 5]:

$$f_1(0) = f_0(0) \equiv \epsilon_{\eta\pi} = \epsilon_{\eta\pi}^{(2)} + \epsilon_{\eta\pi}^{(4)}; \quad \epsilon_{\eta\pi}^{(2)} = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{4} \frac{m_d - m_u}{m_s - \bar{m}}. \quad (3)$$

In Eq. (3), $\epsilon_{\eta\pi}$ is essentially the $\eta - \pi^0$ mixing angle, and $\bar{m}$ denotes the average non-strange current quark mass, $\bar{m} = (m_d + m_u)/2$. The next-order correction to $\epsilon_{\eta\pi}^{(2)}$ is found to be reasonably small, $\epsilon_{\eta\pi}^{(4)}/\epsilon_{\eta\pi}^{(2)} \simeq 0.25$ [3, 9]. We include this correction at $t = 0$ in Eq. (3), and, consequently, will in the sequel adopt the value $\epsilon_{\eta\pi} = 1.34 \times 10^{-2}$, corresponding to the quark mass ratios $m_u/m_d \simeq 0.55$ and $m_s/m_d \simeq 18.9$ [10].¹

The information on the needed ρ' and a'_0 coupling constants is scarce. For the radial excitation of the ρ , in practice only $M_{\rho'} \simeq 1.46$ GeV and $\Gamma_{\rho'} \simeq 0.4$ GeV are found in PDG [11]. We model the form factors for $t \neq 0$ by expressions where the *scale* of the process is set by the isospin breaking parameter $\epsilon_{\eta\pi}$ as an overall factor, times resonant 1^- and 0^+ poles evaluated in the SU(2) (or the SU(3)) limit. This kind of approximation will be used for the relevant coupling constants only, supposedly smooth, but not for the phase space in Eq. (2).

Accordingly, for the spin-1 form factor we assume, along the lines of Ref. [12], the unsubtracted polar form with ρ and ρ'

$$f_1(t) = \epsilon_{\eta\pi} \times \frac{1}{1 + \beta_\rho} \left[\frac{M_\rho^2}{M_\rho^2 - t - iM_\rho\Gamma_\rho(t)} + \beta_\rho \frac{M_{\rho'}^2}{M_{\rho'}^2 - t - iM_{\rho'}\Gamma_{\rho'}(t)} \right], \quad (4)$$

where, denoting by M and Γ the resonance mass and total width, the threshold behaviour of $\rho, \rho' \rightarrow \eta\pi$ is attributed to $\Gamma(t)$:

$$\Gamma(t) = \theta(t - t_0) \frac{M^2}{t} \left(\frac{q(t)}{q(M^2)} \right)^{2L+1} \Gamma. \quad (5)$$

Here, $L = 0, 1$ for spin-0 and 1, respectively, and q is the momentum in the $\eta\pi$ C.M. frame. A similar parameterization was proposed in an approach based on hadron duality and large number of colors N_c , in Ref. [13]. Also, in a sense, Eq. (4) resembles the modification of the ρ propagator introduced in Ref. [14].

Alternatively, one can consider a once-subtracted polar form, also satisfying $f_1(0) = \epsilon_{\eta\pi}$:

$$f_1(t) = \epsilon_{\eta\pi} \times \left[1 + t \frac{f_\rho g_{\rho\pi\pi}}{M_\rho^2} \left(\frac{1}{M_\rho^2 - t - iM_\rho\Gamma_\rho(t)} + \beta_\rho \frac{1}{M_{\rho'}^2 - t - iM_{\rho'}\Gamma_{\rho'}(t)} \right) \right], \quad (6)$$

¹ Also, isospin breaking of electromagnetic origin will here be neglected.

In the above equations, f 's and g 's are the vector meson couplings to e^+e^- and to $\eta\pi$, respectively, for which we have made the assumption $g_{\rho(\rho')\eta\pi} = \epsilon_{\eta\pi} g_{\rho(\rho')\pi\pi}$. Numerically, this determination of the coupling constant $g_{\rho\eta\pi}$ is qualitatively consistent with the estimates, obtained by different approaches, of Refs. [2] and [15, 16]. The coefficient β_ρ in front of the ρ' contribution is defined as $\beta_\rho = (M_\rho/M_{\rho'})^2 \times (f_{\rho'} g_{\rho'\pi\pi}/f_\rho g_{\rho\pi\pi})$. For a qualitative, theoretical, upper limit on the ρ' effects, a calculation within the constituent quark potential model gives $f_{\rho'}/f_\rho \simeq 1.10$ from the ratio of the wave functions at the origin, see, e.g., Ref. [17]. One can assess the value of $g_{\rho'\pi\pi}$ (actually, an upper limit) by identifying $\Gamma(\rho' \rightarrow \pi\pi)$ to $\Gamma_{\rho'} = 0.4$ GeV, so that the upper limit on $|\eta_\rho|$ is derived: $|\beta_\rho| \leq 0.18$. One can notice that, for $\beta_\rho \sim -0.17$, the analogues of Eqs. (4) and (6) reproduce the branching ratio of about 25% for $\tau \rightarrow \pi\pi\nu_\tau$ [11], as well as the fit of the pion form factor from this decay [18]. Finally, from experimental data on ρ decays [11], one obtains the ratio $f_\rho g_{\rho\pi\pi}/M_\rho^2 \simeq 1.2$ needed in Eq. (6), with a small uncertainty.

Apparently, of the two kinds of form factor parameterisation introduced above, Eq. (4) should be preferable, as involving a minimal number of input parameters and being less sensitive to the larger t -behaviour. Nevertheless, also the results from Eq. (6) will be presented, as potentially giving some useful information on the role of the form factor tails and (upper) limits on the effects due to radial excitations in the approach followed here. In Tab. I, we show the predictions for the spin-1 contributions to the decay branching fraction, for $\beta_\rho = 0$ (no ρ'), and for the maximal value $|\beta_\rho| = 0.18$ obtained above.

TABLE I: Spin-1 branching ratio vs. β_ρ .

BR-spin 1	$\beta_\rho = 0$	$\beta_\rho = -0.18$	$\beta_\rho = 0.18$
Eq. (4)	1.69×10^{-6}	3.19×10^{-6}	1.58×10^{-6}
Eq. (6)	3.97×10^{-6}	3.20×10^{-6}	5.70×10^{-6}

The $\beta = 0$ prediction from Eq. (4) is in the ballpark of the earlier estimates, and the addition of the ρ' could double the spin-1 branching fraction. Not unexpectedly, somewhat larger values, still of the same 10^{-6} order of magnitude, are obtained from Eq. (6). One should notice from Eq. (2) that the contribution of $f_1(t)$ is suppressed, relative to $f_0(t)$, by the behaviour of phase space.

We now turn to the spin-0 form factor $f_0(t)$, which we assume to be dominated by a_0

and a'_0 poles, similar to Eqs. (4) and (6). The nature of these scalar mesons is not well-established yet, and we will here assume them to be $q\bar{q}$ bound states. From Eq. (1), $f_0(t)$ is determined by the matrix element

$$\langle \pi^+(k)\eta(p) | i\partial^\mu V_\mu | 0 \rangle = (m_d - m_u) \langle \pi^+(k)\eta(p) | S^{(1+i2)} | 0 \rangle = \sqrt{2} (M_\eta^2 - M_\pi^2) f_0(t), \quad (7)$$

with $S^{(1+i2)} = \bar{u}d$ the quark bilinear scalar density. With the definitions

$$-\sqrt{2}F_{a_0}M_{a_0}^2 = \langle a_0(q) | i\partial^\mu V_\mu | 0 \rangle, \quad -\sqrt{2}F_{a'_0}M_{a'_0}^2 = \langle a'_0(q) | i\partial^\mu V_\mu | 0 \rangle, \quad (8)$$

we modify the a_0 propagator to the unsubtracted polar form satisfying $f_0(0) = f_1(0) = \epsilon_{\eta\pi}$:

$$f_0(t) = \epsilon_{\eta\pi} \times \frac{1}{1 + \beta_a} \left[\frac{M_{a_0}^2}{M_{a_0}^2 - t - iM_{a_0}\Gamma_{a_0}(t)} + \beta_a \frac{M_{a'_0}^2}{M_{a'_0}^2 - t - iM_{a'_0}\Gamma_{a'_0}(t)} \right], \quad (9)$$

and the subtracted version:

$$f_0(t) = \epsilon_{\eta\pi} \times \left[1 + \frac{t f_{a_0} g_{a_0\eta\pi}}{M_\eta^2 - M_\pi^2} \left(\frac{1}{M_{a_0}^2 - t - iM_{a_0}\Gamma_{a_0}} + \beta_a \frac{1}{M_{a'_0}^2 - t - iM_{a'_0}\Gamma_{a'_0}(t)} \right) \right]. \quad (10)$$

Here, the constant f_{a_0} is defined by $F_{a_0} = \epsilon_{\eta\pi} f_{a_0}$ explicitly showing the isospin violation of Eq. (8), and $\Gamma(t)$ is according to Eq. (5). Moreover, $g_{a_0\eta\pi}$ and $g_{a'_0\eta\pi}$ are the coupling constants for the decays of a_0 and a'_0 into $\eta\pi$, respectively, and β_a is the ratio $F_{a'_0}g_{a'_0\eta\pi}/F_{a_0}g_{a_0\eta\pi}$.

The coupling for $a_0 \rightarrow \eta\pi$ has been measured, with the result $g_{a_0\eta\pi} \simeq 2.80$ GeV accompanied by a total width $\Gamma_{a_0} \simeq 100$ MeV [19], compatibly with [11]. As for the $g_{a'_0\eta\pi}$ coupling constant, we assume that the $\eta\pi$, $\eta'\pi$, $K\bar{K}$ and $\omega\pi\pi$ decay channels of the a'_0 saturate the total width $\Gamma_{a'_0} = 265$ MeV. Using the ratios between partial widths $\Gamma(\eta'\pi)/\Gamma(\eta\pi)$, $\Gamma(K\bar{K})/\Gamma(\eta\pi)$ and $\Gamma(\omega\pi\pi)/\Gamma(\eta\pi)$ reported in [11], one would find $\Gamma(a'_0 \rightarrow \eta\pi) \simeq 20$ MeV, and the consequent estimate $g_{a'_0\eta\pi} \simeq 1.32$ GeV. This value is in qualitative agreement with the estimate in Ref. [20] derived from an SU(6) breaking scheme.

To evaluate β_a , we further need a theoretical assessment of the ratio $F_{a'_0}/F_{a_0}$. One possibility could be to use, along the lines of Ref. [2], current algebra equal-time commutators in an SU(6) framework to relate the 0^+ constant F_{a_0} to the analogous 1^+ constant f_{a_1} , and for the latter the 2nd Weinberg sum rule $f_{a_1} = f_\rho$. This would lead to $-F_{a_0} \simeq (m_d - m_u)f_\rho/M_{a_0}^2$, and a similar relation for $F_{a'_0}$, so that:

$$\frac{F_{a'_0}}{F_{a_0}} \simeq \frac{M_{a_0}^2}{M_{a'_0}^2} \frac{f_{\rho'}}{f_\rho}. \quad (11)$$

By using the numerical value for the ratio $f_{\rho'}/f_{\rho}$ suggested by the previous arguments made in connection to Eqs. (4) and (6), one would obtain the estimate $\beta_a \simeq 0.23$.

An alternative is represented by the “linear dual model” exploited in the framework of QCD finite-energy sum rules and local hadron duality in Ref. [21] which, with S denoting 0^+ ‘scalar’, indicates the rules: $M_S^2(n) = (n+1)M_S^2$ in perfect agreement for $n = 1$ with the measured M_{a_0} , and $M_{a'_0}$, and $f_S^2(n) = f_S^2/(n+1)$ hence $F_{a'_0}/F_{a_0} = 0.71$. Numerically, this implies the estimate $\beta_a \simeq 0.33$, compatible within our approximations with the previous one.

Finally, for the value of f_{a_0} , we take the QCD sum rule prediction $F_{a_0} \simeq 1.6$ MeV [22].

These determinations enable us to numerically exploit Eqs. (9) and (10) in the assessment of the spin-0 part of the branching ratio of interest here. The results, for $\beta_a = 0$ and $|\beta_a| = 0.33$ (the largest value estimated above), are displayed in Tab. II.

TABLE II: Spin-0 branching ratio vs. β_a .

BR-spin 0	$\beta_a = 0$	$\beta_a = -0.33$	$\beta_a = 0.33$
Eq. (9)	1.07×10^{-5}	2.26×10^{-5}	6.59×10^{-6}
Eq. (10)	1.52×10^{-5}	1.51×10^{-5}	1.56×10^{-6}

The size of the spin-0 branching ratio can be one order of magnitude larger ($\mathcal{O}(10^{-5})$) than the spin-1 part. For $\beta_a = 0$ (no a'_0), the estimated value is qualitatively consistent with earlier estimates. Including the $a_0(1450)$ contribution, and depending on the value of β , the rate might be increased by a factor of two.

In conclusion, we confirm the orders of magnitude of 10^{-6} and 10^{-5} for the spin-1 and spin-0 branching ratios of previous Standard Model estimates, these predictions therefore seem rather robust. However, the effects from the radial excitations $\rho(1450)$ and $a_0(1450)$ may be non-negligible and amount to a factor of two or so, compared to the simpler ρ and a_0 polar forms. The upper limit from the above tables is $\text{BR}(\tau \rightarrow \eta\pi\nu_\tau) \simeq 2.6 \times 10^{-5}$. On the one side, this value could be in the reach of future high statistics experiments on τ -decays. On the other, considering the current experimental upper limit of order $\mathcal{O}(10^{-4})$, there could still remain some room for an unexpected discovery.

Acknowledgments

This research has been partially supported by MiUR (Italian Ministry of University and Research) and by funds of the University of Trieste. One of the authors (R) would like to thank Abdus Salam ICTP for the hospitality during the summer of 2009, when this work was started. Our deep thanks to Aqeel Ahmed and Jamil Aslam for help in the numerical work.

-
- [1] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. **112**, 1375 (1958).
 - [2] S. Nussinov and A. Soffer, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 033006 (2008).
 - [3] H. Neufeld and H. Rupertsberger, Z. Phys. C **68**, 91 (1995).
 - [4] A. Pich, Phys. Lett. B **196**, 561 (1987)
 - [5] S. Tisserant and T. N. Truong, Phys. Lett. **115B**, 264 (1982).
 - [6] J. E. Bartelt *et al.* (CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 4119 (1996).
 - [7] Y. Meurice, Phys. Rev. D **36**, 2780 (1987); A. Bramon, S. Narison and A. Pich, Phys. Lett. **B 196**, 543 (1987).
 - [8] J. Gasser and H. Lautwyler, Nucl. Phys. B **250**, 517 (1985).
 - [9] G. Ecker, G. Müller, H. Neufeld and A. Pich, Phys. Lett. **B 477**, 88 (200).
 - [10] H. Leutwyler, Phys. Lett. B **378**, 313 (1996).
 - [11] C. Amsler *et al.* (Particle Data Group), Phys. Lett. **B 667**, 1 (2008).
 - [12] J. H. Kühn and A. Santamaria, Z. Phys. C **48**, 445 (1990).
 - [13] C. A. Dominguez, Phys. Lett. B **512**, 331 (2001); for a recent application see, e.g., C. Bruch, A. Khodjamirian and J. H. Kühn, Eur. Phys. J. C **39**, 41 (2005).
 - [14] D. Gómez Dumm, P. Roig, A. Pich and J. Portolés, Phys. Lett. **B 685**, 158 (2010).
 - [15] Ll. Ametller and A. Bramon, Phys. Rev. D **24**, 1325 (1981).
 - [16] H. Genz and S. Tatur, Phys. Rev. D **50**, 3263 (1991).
 - [17] E. Eichten, K. Gottfried, T. Kinoshita, K. D. Lane and T. M Yan, Phys. Rev. **21**, 203 (1980).
 - [18] See, for instance, M. Fujikawa (for the Belle Collaboration), Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) **169**, 36 (2007); and references there.
 - [19] F. Ambrosino *et al.* (KLOE Collaboration), Phys. Lett. **B 681**, 5 (2009).
 - [20] C. Garcia-Recio, L. S. Geng, J. Nieves and L. L. Salcedo, arXiv:1005.0956 [hep-ph].

- [21] A. L. Kataev, Phys. Atom. Nucl. **68**, 567 (2005) [Yad. Fiz. **68**, 597 (2005)].
- [22] S. Narison, Nuovo Cimento **10**, 1 (1987); Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **186**, 306 (2009).